



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

IV. — *The Mode in the Phrases quod sciam, etc.*

BY WILLIAM GARDNER HALE,

PROFESSOR IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

IN my study of the *cum*-constructions, p. 122, I expressed my dissent from one of the two common explanations of the origin of the mode in the phrase *quod sciam*, but did not discuss the other. Nor had I at that time (1889) any theory of my own to advance. Since then, however, I have been brought to an opinion which seems to me to have a good deal of probability in its favor.

The two explanations commonly given are as follows : —

1. The mode is due to the analogy of “restrictive” clauses with *qui quidem*.

If I may trust my collection, the “restrictive” clause in the subjunctive does not occur in early Latin (except in one phrase which is only a variant of *quod sciam*; see Epid. 638, below), while *quod sciam* occurs frequently. The inference is clear. There may well be a connection between the two, but the older construction cannot owe its genesis to the younger.

2. The mode is more generally explained as potential. So Krüger, § 614, Draeger, § 488. The meaning would then originally have been “as regards that which I *perhaps know*,” “so far as my knowledge *may go*.” But such an explanation is forced. The mode to be expected would certainly be the indicative (the determinative relative clause), the meaning being “so far as that which I *know* is concerned,” “so far as I *know*.” And the indicative is indeed actually found to be the only mode employed in the very similar phrases *quod ad me attinet*, *quod potui*, *possum*, *potero*, etc., *quod in te fuit*, and the like.

Under these circumstances, it appears probable that the mode in the phrase under examination is due to some process

of association, from which the indicative phrases given above are free.

The corresponding phrases in English, "so far as I know" and "that I know of," are at least very frequently found after negative antecedents, as in the common "not that I know of" ("I was not crying at anything in particular that I know of," David Copperfield, Cap. VII.), and "not so far as I know." Under the hint given by this fact, I have collected all the examples occurring in Plautus and Terence, to see in how large a proportion of cases *quod sciam* follows a negative. The passages group themselves as follows:—

AFTER NEGATIVE ANTECEDENTS :

Me quidem praesente numquam factumst quod sciam. — Amph. 749.

ERG. Sed num quo foras

Vocatu's hodie ad cenam? HEG. Nusquam quod sciam. — Capt. 172-3.

HEG. Secede huc tu : nam sunt, quae ex te solo scitari volo,  
Quarum rerum te falsilocum mihi esse nolo. PHIL. Non ero,  
Quod sciam. — Capt. 263-5.

EPID. Non me novisti? TEL. Quod quidem nunc veniat in mentem mihi. — Epid. 638.

Non edepol te, quod sciam, umquam ante hunc diem  
Vidi neque novi. — Men. 500, 501.

Dic mihi, en umquam intestina tibi crepant, quod sentias? — Men. 925.

Numquam nummum, quod sciam. — Most. 1011.

Nullumst periculum, quod sciam, stipularier,  
Ut concepisti verba. — Pseud. 1076.

Nam equidem illic uterum quod sciam numquam extumere sensi.  
— Truc. 200.

Nam numquam ante hunc diem meis oculis eam, quod nossem,  
videram. — Hec. 863.

MI. Tune has pepulisti fores?

\* \* \* \* \*

Nihil mihi respondes? AE. Non equidem istas, quod sciam.  
— Ad. 638, 641.

AFTER TANTUM :

CYL. Est tibi Menaechmo nomen? MEN. Tantum quod sciam.  
— Men. 297.

CHAR. Numquid est quod dicas aliud de illo? EYT. Tantumst  
quod sciam. — Merc. 642.

AFTER POSITIVE ANTECEDENTS :

Vigilo hercle equidem, quod sciam. — Men. 504.

Minas quadraginta accepisti, quod sciam,  
A Philolachete. — Most. 1010.

(In Truc. 298, *quod scias* seems not to belong to the idiom under discussion. In Pseud. 566, *atque etiam certum quod sciam* is clearly corrupt, and is bracketed by Goetz and Ussing.)

The second group really belongs with the first, standing in the same relation to it as the subjunctive after *solus est qui* (cf. *solus hic homost qui sciat divinitus*, Curc. 248) to the subjunctive after *nemo est qui*.

We may therefore, for Plautus and Terence, count 13 cases after the negative and the like (11 + 2), as against 2 cases after positives.

This state of affairs makes it probable that the subjunctive idiom came in through the frequent use of the phrase after negative antecedents and the like, after which beginning it ultimately (before the literary period) made itself the unvarying mode. An illustration of the extreme naturalness of the phrase after a negative may be seen in Men. 1106: *nil reticebo quod sciam*. (The mode in cases like the last has been more fully discussed in my *cum*-constructions, p. 133, than the scope of the present article warrants.)

On the other hand, it will be recognized at once that phrases like *quod ad me attinet*, *quod potui*, *possum*, *potero*, etc., *quod in te fuit*, and the like have not come under the same influence as the *quod sciam* clause, since they do not belong naturally after negative antecedents.

The conclusion which I have now drawn is still further supported by a comparison of the examples in the following pairs, after the words *primus* and *unus*.

*Quod* litteris *exstet*, Pherecydes Syrius *primus* dixit animos esse hominum sempiternos (Cic. Tusc. 1, 16, 38) ; Romanorum *primus*, *quantum* ego quidem *sciam*, condidit aliqua in hanc materiam M. Cato ille Censorius (Quintil. 3, 1, 19).

Quamquam enim adeo excellebat Aristides abstinencia, ut *unus* post hominum memoriam, *quem* quidem nos *audierimus*, cognomine Iustus sit appellatus, tamen . . . (Nep. Arist. 1, 2) ; nec est quod te pudeat sapienti adsentiri, qui se *unus*, *quod sciam*, sapientem profiteri sit ausus (Cic. Fin. 2, 26, 82).

In my *cum*-constructions, p. 120, I have treated the "restrictive" clauses after *qui quidem* as of consecutive origin; and in the German translation (Teubner, 1892), I have presented at considerable length proofs of the soundness of this position. The facts on which the incorrect explanation numbered (1) above is based are therefore accounted for. The *quod sciam* idiom is not descended from the *qui quidem* idiom (which is not only younger, but often also takes the indicative), nor *vice versa*, but the subjunctive in *quod sciam* and the subjunctive after *qui quidem* go back to the same beginnings; for the subjunctive after negative antecedents, and antecedents like *unus*, *solus*, *primus*, etc., is of consecutive origin.

When the first draft of the above was read, at the meeting of the Philological Association, Professor Gildersleeve pointed out that I might have included in my treatment the French phrase *pas que je sache*. The phrase is doubly interesting, first from the fact that it again betrays how naturally the idea of *quod sciam* follows a negative, and secondly because it recalls a controversy, indirectly concerning it, in Vol. I, Nos. 2 and 4, and Vol. II, No. 6, of the American Journal of Philology, in which Professor Garner urged that *sache*, in the phrase *je ne sache pas*, is, contrary to common opinion, an indicative, while Professor Lodeman defended it as a subjunctive. As regards the dependent clause *que je sache*, it would probably be found, on examination, to have descended directly from the Latin *quod sciam*.